

lots of precedent, lots of delineation by court cases is, I think, unnecessary. I hope the Chair will divide the question. I intend to support amendments one and three.

PRESIDENT: Do you wish to make a comment, Senator Chambers, on the question, or dividing the question? Very well. The question is clearly divisible and in accordance with Senator Landis' request we will be voting one at a time on amendments one and three, but the debate will continue on the general proposition I suppose on the amendment. Okay, we will continue then on the first, item one. Yes, on one. Excuse me, items one and three to be considered as one point of discussion and item two under the amendment the second, and the Chair recognizes Senator Pirsch.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the body, I oppose the proposed amendment by Senator Chambers in entirety and particularly want to point out on the Section 1 that that is old language. That is not changing the amendment, or the bill that was originally intended. It is old language, one that has been in the law, and I think you would be making a great mistake to change that old language because it is already withstanding in the law. Now it is amazing to me how, referring to number two of this, that Senator Chambers is so concerned with the manufacturer of the drugs. I wish he had come forward with an amendment that would make that stronger then, a stronger penalty for the manufacturer instead of trying to undo and delete and dilute the proposed legislation. We added manufacturer to this old language so we could include those manufacturers that Senator Chambers was so irate about. And I also want to point out that the General Model Act calls a penalty of a felony for this and in many states it is a felony for this kind of violation. We have made it, for the first offense, a Class III misdemeanor, for second and all subsequent offenses, a Class II misdemeanor. Now if we want to make it more difficult or a stiffer penalty for the manufacturer, I would go along with that kind of an amendment, but we can see what Senator Chambers is trying to do. He is not really interested in getting the manufacturer. He is just interested in diluting and defeating this bill. With that, I would urge you not to vote for any of the amendments that he proposes. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Yes, we are considering the amendment which would add on page 4 of the bill, striking "or" and replacing